

REMARKS

Claims 21 and 23-31 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Pierce and Examiner Cole for the interview on August 19, 2003. As agreed in the interview, Applicants have amended the claims to recite that the webs are prebonded and that the bond site have an aspect ratio of greater than 3.

Rejection Under 35 USC 103

The Office Action states that Claims 1-5, 8, 21, and 24-27 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,851,935 in view of McCormack, U.S. Patent No. 5,964,742. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seward (U.S. Patent No. 4,062,993) in view of Srinivasan, et al. and in view of McCormack, et al. Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan, et al. and in view of McCormack, et al. and Griesbach, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,587,225). Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan, et al. and in view of McCormack, et al. and Phan, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,338,766).

Each of the above rejections relies upon the aspect ratio of McCormack, et al. McCormack, et al. discloses that "The novel S-weave pattern may be used to self-bond fabrics and should be distinguished from patterns made to laminate materials together which are significantly different." (column 11, lines 1-5) McCormack teaches away from using an S-weave pattern to laminate materials together. In the present invention, materials are laminated together using a plurality of bonds having an aspect ratio greater than about 3. All independent claims have the aspect ratio of greater than about 3. Additionally, all independent claims in the present invention require that the first and second webs are prebonded. By the amendments presented and the remarks, Applicants assert that one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to develop the present invention based on the teachings of the above- referenced prior art.

Appl. No. 09/584,676
Atty. Docket No. 7897R
Amdt. dated August 25, 2003
Reply to Office Action of March 6, 2003
Customer No. 27752

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 103. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place their application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 21 and 23-31.

Respectfully submitted,
John J. Curro, et al.

By Angela Marie Stone
Angela Marie Stone
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,335
(513)634-9397

August 25, 2003
Customer No. 27752